DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 436 CS 212 022

AUTHOR Mulcrone, Mick
TITLE On the Razor's Edge: The Irish-American Press on the Eve of World War One.
PUB DATE Aug 89
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (72nd, Washington, DC, August 10-13, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Status; *Journalism History; Mass Media Role; *Newspapers
IDENTIFIERS Ethnic Newspapers; *Irish Americans; Journalism Research; *World War I

ABSTRACT

A study examined three partisan Irish-American newspapers ("Irish World," "Gaelic-American," and the "Leader") representative of the Irish-American press before the First World War. The newspapers appealed to different constituencies, had contrasting orientations, and enjoyed substantial influence within the Irish-American community. The primary role of the Irish-American press at the beginning of the twentieth century was to make sense out of the tangle of aspirations and insecurities and to devise comprehensible strategies by which respectability and acceptance might be won by the Irish in America. As the world moved inexorably toward World War One, the Irish-American press would scramble for a strategy by which hatred of Britain and all things Anglo-Saxon might somehow be kept in harmony with loyalty to the United States. Irish immigrants remained in search of a definition of themselves, and the Irish-American press provided that definition in the American context. The Irish-American press provided a critical forum in which the passions, insecurities, and conflicting yearnings of the Irish might be voiced and reconciled. The Irish-American press stood not merely as an ethnic supplement to the mainstream press, but as its adversary. (Ninety-four notes are included.) (RS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED311436

# ON THE RAZOR'S EDGE: THE IRISH-AMERICAN PRESS ON THE EVE OF WORLD WAR ONE

Mick Mulcrone
Graduate Student
School of Communications DS-40
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98145

Paper Submitted to History Division
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
For A.E.J.M.C. Annual Convention
Washington D.C.
August 1989

CS212022

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mick Mulcrone

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

# On the Razor's Edge: The Irish-American Press On the Eve of World War I.

## Introduction

In the first decades of the 20th century, urban America teemed with immigrants. Most cities outside of the Deep South held substantial immigrant populations. Four of every ten inhabitants of New York City in 1910 were foreign-born. In San Francisco, one in three was an immigrant. In parts of New England, the level approached 50 percent.[1]

The flood of newcomers--with their old world loyalties and their bewildering babble of tongues--chafed at accepted notions of American identity. The very definition of American was under challenge.

A resurgent nativism based upon the inherent superiority of Anglo-Saxons was but one response.[2] Debates raged within intellectual circles and spilled out into the media--over the relative merits of cultural pluralism versus melting-pot theories of assimilation.[3]

The immigrant press played a role in the debate over the future course of American culture. Immigrant newspapers provided vital forums through which immigrant aspirations could be articulated and resolved. The immigrant press was at once an expression of ethnic distinctiveness and a site of struggle against (and at times acquiescence to) acculturation and domination by the mainstream native majority.

In his post World War I study of the immigrant press, Robert Park concluded that immigrant newspapers serve two functions:

They enable immigrants to maintain a sense of ethnic identity while at the same time easing their assimilation into the mainstream of American life. The press can either enhance or delay the process of Americanization.[4]

Park's enhancer-delayer model, while valid, is inadequate to a complete understanding of the role of the immigrant press in the first decades of the 20th century. This paper, which discusses the editorial content of three Irish-American newspapers in the years immediately prior to America's entry into World War I, suggests that immigrant newspapers satisfied other needs.

Irish-American consciousness was both forged by and reflected in the Irish-American press. The press gave expression to immigrant yearnings and insecurities. It sought to secure a place for the Irish in America in what was often perceived as a hostile Anglo-Saxon environment.

The question of whether the Irish-American press molded readers' attitudes or mirrored the collective mind is essentially circular. In one sense, the newspapers examined in this study were partisan advocates of different agendas. In another, they responded to the call of a broader mandate and were but separate voices in a collective cry. What the Fishmans noted in regard to the foreign-language press applies also to the pre-War Irish-American press:

> . . . an intimacy between writers and readers . . . does not commonly exist in other large urban publications. The experience of having gone through thick and thin together (is indication of) . . . the communion which often exists

between the foreign-language press and its public.[5]

## Research Questions

This paper attempts to answer two questions: 1.) By what means did the Irish-American press reconcile ethnic identity with the pressures towards assimilation? 2.) What needs did the Irish-American press fulfill within the Irish-American community?

Irish editors labored to devise strategies by which acceptance might be achieved by the Irish in America. But acceptance is not synonymous with assimilation, which implies absorption in the mainstream of American life and the eventual disappearance of ethnic distinctiveness.

The Irish longed to be fully accepted as Americans, but not at the cost of ethnic identity. Rather than choose one of two mutually exclusive paths--assimilation or separatism--the Irish-American press chose a third in its struggle to harmonize the demands of ethnicity with the realities of life in the new world. The goal was to create something new--an Irish-American community in America.[6]

Scholars agree that the immigrant press thrived largely because its readers, unable to comprehend the English-language press, depended on foreign-language newspapers for the information they needed to adjust to the alien environment of urban America.[7] The Irish, however, could read English and could, as a consequence, turn to the mainstream press for such

information as was needed to order their lives. This suggests that the Irish-American press satisfied radically different needs, needs which the mainstream press--in its appeal to the broad middle--was unable or unwilling to satisfy. Irish editors interpreted events from a distinctly Irish perspective which often stood at odds with mainstream interpretations.

In 1910, almost every major city outside of the Deep South supported at least one newspaper devoted to Irish interests. These newspapers were weeklies and many enjoyed national and international circulation. Irish newspapers flourished along the eastern seaboard and throughout the Midwest. New York alone had five Irish papers. Boston regularly supported two.[8]

Nationalism fueled by anti-British sentiment was the driving force behind the Irish press as it had been since the founding of the first Irish weekly, The Shamrock, in 1810.[9] Yet the Irishhungered also for acceptance in America and they continued to be haunted by nagging feelings of inferiority that their rising status did little to assuage. The United States, in the years before World War I, was still an Anglo-Saxon nation; the inner sanctums of power and prestige remained off-limits to the upstart Irish. Ignored by the mainstream media, these concerns found expression in the Irish-American press.

## Methods

The three newspapers in this study were chosen because they appealed to different constituencies, had contrasting

orientations and enjoyed substantial influence within the national Irish-American community. Despite their differences, however, the papers spoke as one in their efforts to win acceptance for the Irish in America. The entire content of each of the papers was read and analyzed. Particular attention was devoted to editorials. The sample of newspapers is intended not as a definitive description of the entire Irish-American press but as a representative cross section of that press as it existed at a particular moment in time.

The Irish World, published in New York since 1870, was for decades the largest and most influential newspaper of its kind in America. The Irish World was edited by founder Patrick Ford until his death in 1913. Born in Ireland, Ford came to the United States in 1844 as a child of seven. His experiences as a young man in Boston during the full fury of Yankee nativism--when signs advising "No Irish Need Apply" were everywhere in evidence --convinced Ford that even in America, the Irish were victimized by British tyranny.

Ford broke into the newspaper business at age 15 as a printer's devil on William Lloyd Garrison's Liberator, where he absorbed not only the basics of the trade, but also Garrison's passionate concern for social justice. Ford later became editor of the Boston Tribune. Following the Civil War he edited the South Carolina Leader, which agitated for black rights, and after a failed attempt at Irish journalism in South Carolina, he founded the Irish World.

The Irish World espoused a variety of radical social agendas in the long course of its evolution and it was staunch in its support of the struggle in Ireland. In the 1880's, the Irish World endorsed labor agitation in the United States and sponsored fund raising drives in support of rent boycotts in Ireland and bombing campaigns in Britain.

By the eve of World War I, however, the Irish World had embarked upon a more moderate course. Abandoning its radical social agenda, it promoted middle-class values and labor harmony as the proper strategies for achieving respectability and acceptance for the Irish in America. The Irish World also turned away from armed struggle in favor of parliamentary methods in behalf of Ireland's campaign for independence from Great Britain. The Irish World is representative of those Irish-American newspapers which advocated moderate social and political agendas. Estimated circulation in 1913 was 60,000.[10]

The Gaelic-American--also published in New York--was the nearest rival to the Irish World in influence if not circulation. Estimated circulation of the Gaelic-American was 30,000.[11] Edited by John Devoy, who was exiled to the United States in 1871 for revolutionary activities in Ireland, the Gaelic-American was the most strident voice of Irish nationalism in America. The Gaelic-American is representative of those papers whose existence was grounded in the advancement of nationalist positions.

Devoy served for a time as foreign editor at the New York Herald before founding the Gaelic-American in 1902. Despite his

devotion to the struggle in Ireland, Devoy was sensitive also to the needs of the Irish in America. Devoy lived out most of his life in the United States and the Gaelic-American, like the Irish World, advocated social mobility as a means of achieving acceptance. But unlike the Irish World, the Gaelic-American continued to espouse armed struggle to achieve Ireland's independence. Respectability would only be won by the Irish in America, the Gaelic-American insisted, when Ireland took its place among the independent nations of the earth.

The San Francisco Leader was founded in 1902 by Peter Yorke, an Irish-born priest. Although not an official diocesan publication, the Leader represented a kind of nationalist/Catholic hybrid that was common in the Irish-American press. The church--along with politics and the labor movement--was one of the few arenas of Irish predominance around the turn of the century and Irish clerics--whether American-born or immigrant--often brought an Irish perspective to the Catholic newspapers they edited. San Francisco was also unique in that the Irish who settled there suffered little of the discrimination and social ostracism their fellow countrymen endured in other parts of the nation.[11]

The Leader also differed from its New York counterparts in that it was more overtly commercial. The Leader carried a larger percentage of advertising than either the Irish World or the Gaelic-American and it often sponsored flamboyant contests to increase circulation. The Leader also carried "soft" news

and regular features devoted to women, children and the needs of the home. The Gaelic-American, by contrast, was almost completely dependent upon subscriptions and patronage for survival and made little effort to broaden its appeal. The Irish World fell somewhere in between.[13]

Despite these differences in orientation and economic structure, all three newspapers were unashamedly partisan: Advocacy rather than objectivity was the driving force behind the Irish World, the Gaelic-American and the Leader. News and opinion were inseparable and stood, as often as not, as mirror images of one another. Facts were wielded as weapons in a collective war of advocacy and complaint.

The mainstream daily press, by contrast, had been abandoning partisanship and personal journalism since before the turn of the century.[14] Mainstream newspapers were motivated primarily by the need to turn a profit: Necessity demanded that they appeal to a mass audience by offending as few readers as possible. In an effort to deliver increasing numbers of consumers to advertisers the mainstream press, according to Baldasty and Rutenbeck, was attempting to ". . . be all things to all people."[15] News was fast becoming a commodity in service to the cycle of production and consumption.

## The Special Role of the Irish-American Press

The example of the Irish-American press suggests that at least some ethnic newspapers pursued a much different agenda.

The Irish World, the Gaelic-American and the Leader satisfied needs which the mainstream press ignored. The research presented here demonstrates: 1.) The Irish-American press employed anglophobia as the primary strategy by which ethnic identity might be reconciled with the desire for acceptance; 2.) The Irish-American press, despite its often middle-class orientation, functioned as a stridently partisan alternative to the mainstream daily newspapers. Irish-Americans relied on the mainstream daily press for the news of the day; they turned to the Irish press to find out what the news meant.

Irish-American newspapers interpreted events from an Irish-American perspective. They appealed to their readers not as potential consumers, but as members of a far-flung community separated by geography but united by commonalities of history, culture and blood.

The Irish-American press labored to secure the status of the immigrant Irish not by promoting their absorption into the anonymity of mainstream American life, nor by advocating separatist isolation. It sought, rather, to reconcile the demands of ethnicity with the realities of life in America--a merging of both in the creation of something new.

## Historical Background: Irish-Americans Before the War

By 1910 Irish immigrants and their first generation, American-born children numbered 4.5 million, surpassing even the

population of Ireland.[16] In all, between 15 and 20 million Americans could claim Irish ancestry.[17]

Immigration continued, but the numbers were in decline. From a peak of 219,000 in the post-Famine year of 1851, the exodus from Ireland to America had fallen to less than 50,000 by 1910.[18] The native-born now outnumbered their immigrant parents two-to-one. The diaspora had begun to abate; Irish-America was coming of age.

The Irish could look to many examples of success as evidence of their rising status. They were a powerful presence in politics. Irishmen were now mayors of major cities and in New York, the capitol of immigrant America, they had seized control of the Tammany machine and would control it as an Irish fiefdom for more than 50 years.

In the economic arena, the Irish had achieved relative occupational parity with native white Americans. The prospect of social mobility--denied in Ireland--had awakened a hunger for achievement. A larger proportion of Irish children were attending college than those of WASP parentage. And although most Irish were still members of the working class on the eve of World War I, they enjoyed--because of their dominance of the American Federation of Labor--a major share of the best paid union jobs.[19]

But not everyone shared in the spoils of the new world. Despite advances, many were left behind by the rising tide of social mobility. In 1900, one in every four Irish-born males

and one of every seven American-born males of Irish descent still worked in unskilled, poorly-paid occupations. Irish females continued to scour floors for the urban elite or labor in the sweat shops of the textile industry.[10]

Thus, the conflicting realities of their collective status offered mixed signals to the Irish. And none were more aware of their insecurity nor more sensitive to snubs from Anglo-Saxon America than those who hungered most for social recognition--the rising middle class, whose ". . . influence in public life increased out of all proportion to their status in private life."[11]

The resurgence in the 1890's of a nativism based on the inherent superiority of the Anglo-Saxon kept old wounds festering.[12] The appearance of the British-American Association signaled a growing emphasis on America's Anglo-Saxon past and an increasing desire for closer relations with Britain. The troublesome Irish were viewed as obstacles to all that was proper and progressive. The Atlantic Monthly warned:

> The only hope for the Irish lies in the mingling of their blood with that of native Americans. Even those . . . who move up, rise to the level of saloon keepers. When they enter politics, they leave all honesty behind, perhaps because they have always thought of governments as oppressors. They pose a danger of changing and turning the U.S. away from its friendly, close ties with the English.[13]

But the most stinging rebuke--and the one most often repeated in the Irish press--was delivered by President Woodrow Wilson at the May, 1914 dedication of a memorial to the Irish-born Revolutionary War hero, Commodore John Barry. Before a crowd of Irish gathered in celebration, Wilson observed:

> There are citizens of the United States . . . born under other flags, but welcomed under our generous naturalization laws to the full freedom and opportunity of America, who have poured the poison of disloyalty into the very arteries of our national life."[10]

The President further rebuked the Irish by praising Barry as an Irishman whose ". . . heart crossed the Atlantic with him," while castigating those who ". . . need hyphens in their names because only part of them has come over." The implication was clear: The loyalty of Irish-Americans was suspect.

The Irish press responded to the rising but still insecure status of the Irish and to indignities both real and imagined by sounding the ancestral cry--often to the point of shrillness--and laying all blame at the feet of the Anglo-Saxon. If some immigrant Irish were ill-equipped for life in urban America, it was because of past deprivations under British colonial rule. If they suffered discrimination in the United States, it was due to Anglo-Saxon influence. As one student of immigration observed, many factors contributed to Irish insecurity, but ". . . most important, WASP non-recognition of Irish-American accomplishments embittered the Irish middle class and kept old, inherited wounds fresh."[11]

Some within the Irish community--those who had made their way into the upper-middle class--longed only to abandon these ancestral concerns and disappear as quickly as possible into the anonymity of mainstream America. For most, however, nationalism served as both a psychological balm and a source of tribal identity. They looked to the press to give shape to these

nebulous, nagging aspirations and to somehow incorporate them into a broader strategy of achieving legitimacy and acceptance for the Irish in America.

## I. Acceptance Not Assimilation

### The Anglo-American Conspiracy

The Anglo-American rapprochement and the struggle for national independence in Ireland dominated the editorial content of the Leader, the Irish World, and the Gaelic-American in the years leading up to World War I. These issues raised into high relief the tangle of conflicting passions and aspirations that existed within the Irish-American community. But one concern overwhelmed all others--the need to reconcile ethnic identity with loyalty to America.

Anglophobia was the central element of Irish-American identity as defined by the press. A combination of ancestral hatred of Britain that survived from the old country and a fear of Anglo-Saxon influence in the new, anglophobia was a cornerstone of the Irish-American experience. It provided the intellectual and emotional framework by which attitudes were defined and events made comprehensible.

Many if not most Irish-Americans felt great antipathy toward Great Britain.[8] Throughout the 19th century, Irish-Americans funded bombing campaigns in Britain and rebellions and rent boycotts in Ireland. Following the American Civil War, Irish

veterans of the Union Army launched an unsuccessful invasion of British-held Canada. Prior to America's entry into World War I, the vast majority of Irish-Americans longed for Britain's defeat.[9]

The Irish-American press railed against Saxon influence long before the 1916 Easter rebellion in Dublin rallied even the lethargic, and long after American sympathies in the War turned in favor of Britain--when pragmatism should have dictated a more muted response.

The anglophobic imperative overwhelmed social, political, and regional differences. It was the matrix which bound the Irish together in a sense of peoplehood and common purpose. But it would also become also a source of travail, calling down charges of disloyalty upon some Irish-Americans and forcing their press to scramble for a strategy by which loyalty to the United States might be reconciled with hatred of Britain.

The movement for closer ties with Great Britain, which had begun to gather strength before the turn of the century, was a source of great concern among Irish-Americans. Many attributed America's burgeoning imperial presence to British influence.[10]

The mood of rapprochement pervaded many areas of American thought. An emergent imperial school of history sought to rewrite American history from a British perspective. Revisionist historians glorified--and amplified--the role of English Puritans in early colonial America while ignoring the contributions of other ethnic groups.[11]

Fired by ancestral loyalties and fearing the threat to their own tenuous status, Irish-Americans challenged the Anglo-onslaught in every available public forum. The Irish Historical Society, founded in 1897 to counter the revisionist movement, praised--and often exaggerated--Irish contributions to American history. In the political arena, Irish lobbyists helped defeat three of four arbitration treaties negotiated with Britain between the years 1897-1911.[30] In 1907, the Ancient Order of Hibernians joined forces with the National German-American Alliance to lobby against immigration restrictions and foreign alliances, both of which were seen as part of the anglo-conspiracy.[31] Ethnic leaders even condemned Rhodes scholarships as part of an insidious British plot to reconquer America.[32]

The Irish press led the attack, dismissing the growing fascination with all things Anglo-Saxon as a betrayal of American traditions:

> These denationalized Americans would have us forget the American revolution and all it accomplished. In their opinion it was a huge mistake . . . a blunder committed by Washington and his compatriots.[33]

> (The idea) . . . that the American people are overwhelmingly of English blood will soon have to be dropped. . . . (It is) . . . an impudent claim, repeated at every opportunity by Anglomaniacs and echoed by fools who know no better.[34]

> The so-called Anglo-Saxon is a negligible citizen. . . He is not a good American. It has not occurred to him that he is not American nor is the dwindling personnel he speaks of the nation. The Puritan has passed; the Anglo-Saxon is a joke. A new and better American is here.[35]

Evidence of the anglo-infestation was everywhere. Seemingly insignificant incidents swelled into portents of great alarm.

The playing of the English national anthem by student musicians at a convent school in New York was tantamount to giving " . . . reverence to the traditions of the hereditary enemy of their race and religion."[18] A proposal to reorganize the United States Army along territorial lines was ridiculed as an attempt by "Anglomaniac toadies" to anglicize the American armed forces.[19]

A Carnegie-sponsored celebration to commemorate a century of peace with England inspired particular scorn. Arguments against "100 Years of Peace" were framed in patriotic terms in an attempt to equate Irish anglophobia with American interests. The Irish World condemned a proposal to issue a postage stamp in honor of the occasion as " . . . placing our country in the humiliating position of being a junior partner in the firm of John Bull and Company." The paper urged its readers to commemorate instead the burning of the Capitol in 1812, " . . . an act of wanton and unprovoked savagery unparalleled in the annals of modern history."[20] The Leader was even more venomous in its attacks:

> Feeble editorials have appeared . . . urging their readers to get in line and whoop things up for the dear, old "step-mother" country. . . . the celebration will be a failure. Americans are not to be fooled even by Carnegie millions. They recognize Britain as their bitterest enemy and this cant about a general jollification because Britain didn't put herself in the way of getting another walloping during the past 100 years is not fooling them at all.[21]

The Leader urged its Irish readers toward ever greater paroxysms of patriotic fervor and anglophobic passion.

Affection for Britain--from whatever quarter--was incompatible with true Americanism:

> No soft soaping of Carnegie and his millions, or the flapdoodle twaddle of a misfit ambassador will make liberty-loving Americans sycophants of a decayed monarchy.[40]

## Obsession with the Past

To bolster its attacks against British influence in the United States, the Irish press recalled the long history of British involvement in Ireland. This obsession with the past served two purposes--it cast suspicion on present British intentions and it forged a sense of solidarity, particularly among younger Irish-Americans, by re-enforcing the collective mythos of Irish-America as a nation in exile.

No event was more often repeated than the Great Famine of 1845-1848--an apocalyptic event which changed the course of modern Irish history and with it the collective Irish consciousness (and in no small way American history). In mid-19th century Ireland, potatoes were the main and sometimes sole source of nutrition for most of Ireland's peasant population. When blight destroyed successive harvests, one million died of starvation or fever. Another 1.7 million fled to America from hunger and mass eviction.[41].

The Famine had all the dimensions of a holocaust. According to one contemporary account:

> . . . horrors of war have seldom equalled and certainly ever succeeded those of the Irish famine of '47.' The babe suckling at the dead mother's breast, whole families living

on putrid carrion, hundreds dying and dead by the wayside.[43]

Britain maintained a laissez-faire attitude and offered little assistance. Food was exported while hundreds of thousands starved. Those who took flight shared ocean-side docks with tons of Irish grain and livestock bound for Britain in payment of rents. The London Times rejoiced that soon Irishmen would be as ". . . rare on the banks of the Liffey as a red man on the banks of the Manhattan."[44]

That wish was in part fulfilled. The Famine set in motion a tradition of mass emigration to America that would last well into the 20th century. In 1845--on the eve of the Famine--the population of Ireland approached nine million. By 1914, it had dwindled to less than 4.5 million.

In the Irish-American press, Famine recollections were recounted in the language of a shared nightmare:

> . . . an appalling picture springs up from memory. . . ghosts walk the land. . . . great giant figures reduced to skeletons by hunger, shake in their clothes. (There are) no graves, but pits are dug. . . . those who have managed to escape this dread visitation are flying panic-stricken to the seaports . . . to famine ships and fever.[45]

Those who survived the ocean crossing in cramped, fever-ridden ships were cast exhausted and ill-equipped upon the eastern cities of America. The hostile reception that awaited the destitute Irish--who swarmed into tenements or spilled out into shantytowns--only exacerbated their confusion and rage.

Even success became cause to condemn Britain. Those who escaped the ". . . unbroken chain of graves wherever the tide of emigration extended"[46] contributed to building of the United

States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand when they should instead have ". . . enriched the land of their birth."[46] As the Irish World observed:

> People who left Ireland carried with them a . . . sting of resentment which became intensified when, by their experience of life in America, they had practical illustration of what their native country could be when under free institutions.[47]

Britain was blamed also for the present status of Ireland. Contemporary circumstances were interpreted in the vocabulary of past wrongs. The legacy of British law and imperial might was held responsible for both the moribund condition of Irish industry and for the dissolute state of the Irish people:

> A depopulated Ireland is England's stern accuser. . .Ireland alone, among all nations of the world, is a land whose population has been more than cut in two; whose industries have been killed; whose cities and towns have been turned into grazing grounds for bullocks. . . . (in the cities) 20,000 families are living in single room tenements in buildings which, in the days of the Irish Parliament, housed the intellect and wealth of Ireland.[48]

England, in the collective mythos, had "'. . . crippled the Irish deliberately,' unfitting them for success abroad while obliging their exodus."[49] And if the Irish press was guardian of the collective memory and rage, the Irish-in-exile were to be agents of its vengeance. "It's hard to forget," the Leader observed. "Is it possible to forgive?"[50] For the Gaelic-American, the answer was clear:

> The exiles who were driven out everywhere on the lone highways of the world have everywhere risen up like armed avengers to demand an accounting. . . . Empire building does not pay.[51]

By 1914, most of the exiles of the Famine had passed on. But the horrors of the Great Hunger--as the Famine came to be

known--and the shame and humiliation of its American aftermath, were seared into folk memory to survive down the generations. The legacy of the Famine continued, fed by lingering memories, rumblings of Anglo-Saxon ascendancy and constant reminders in the Irish-American press. Although the status of the Irish was much improved, the awareness of past indignities and present insecurities kept feelings of inferiority alive, and nourished the ancestral hatred for all things Anglo-Saxon.

## Self-Image: Inferiority and Pride

Britain was held responsible not only for the despoilation of Ireland and the scattering of her people but also for the low self-esteem of the Irish or what the press called the "slave mentality," a malaise afflicting the Irish on both sides of the Atlantic.

If the Irish peasant was lazy and unproductive, it was due to 17th-century British policies ". . . which would have destroyed industry among the Dutch or the Chinese."[8] If the Irish were ashamed of their language--the oldest written vernacular north of the Alps--it was because Britain had characterized the Celts as ". . . barbarous and illiterate from the beginning of time."[9]

The Irish press labored to instill a sense of self-confidence and pride among its readers by glorying over Irish accomplishments and culture while scorning English contributions. "(We) were a civilized race," the Leader

boasted, "when the English were digging acorns in the forested wilds."[34]

Another strategy was to portray the Irish as possessing racial attributes superior to those of the more brutish British. Celtic "spirituality" and "love of justice" stood in contrast to Saxon "hypocrisy" and "blind, stupid materialism."[35] In an ironic twist, the Irish press repeatedly accused the British of shortcomings more often associated with the Irish. To counter the reputed (and well-documented) Irish fondness for drink, the Leader insisted:

> If there is any nation that can furnish a more disgusting spectacle of the booze habit than Great Britain, then there are multitudes from Missouri . . . who are willing to be shown.[36]

The press regularly railed against the "slave mentality," a vestige of colonialism which had robbed the Irish of their confidence. "The slave mind," the Gaelic-American argued, ". . . has destroyed our moral courage."[37] "I shake my fist in England's face for having sapped (our) manhood so cunningly away," wrote an essayist in the Leader.[38]

One manifestation of the "slave mind" was the recurring belief that England had been guilty of no special wrong against Ireland.[39] Other manifestations included Irish doubts about their ability to govern themselves,[40] and the desire to "be lorded over" by the English."[41]

The press damned all who exhibited shame of their heritage or sought to curry favor from apologists of Anglo-Saxonism. On one occasion, the Leader chastised a Bostonian named Hogan who

went to court to change his name because it was "suggestive of Irish origin."[62] The Gaelic-American regularly condemned "blatherskites" who exhibited "Anglomaniac" tendencies. The Irish World despaired:

> What then is the source of the racial weakness which torments us . . . . We have retained our physical courage, but long subjugation to foreign rule . . . (has) sapped our moral vitality. Here in this free land the restoration to perfect moral health should have begun earlier and should have progressed further than in Ireland.[63]

The Irish press offered two mutually reinforcing strategies to resolve this crisis of the spirit: social mobility in America; and freedom for Ireland through the dissolution of the British empire. Socio-economic success and cooperation with other ethnic groups (other than Anglo-Saxons) would enable Irish-Americans to forge a powerful alliance and thereby assist "their kindred in Ireland throw off the age-long yoke of England."[64] The demise of Great Britain--"the harlot of nations, the modern Babylon"--[65] and the resultant entry of Ireland among the nations of the world would vindicate the Irish in America and allow them to blossom into their full potential as a people.

Not only the Irish, but all of mankind would benefit, according to the press. The "world will be sweeter when the British Empire is burned up," promised the Irish World.[66] "Forever blessed be the toe of the boot that administers that glorious kick," the Leader declared.[67]

## II. An Alternative Press

## Caricatures and Catholicism

Complaints against social and economic discrimination were common in the 19th century Irish press. By 1914, these complaints were largely absent from the pages of the Leader, the Irish World, and the Gaelic-American. Economic inequities remained, but the days of "No Irish Need Apply" were, for the most part, past.

Discrimination survived in more subtle ways. And the Irish press raged at its every manifestation. One area of concern (often to the point of hypersensitivity) was the image of the Irish in popular culture. Another was religion.

For the Leader, the specter of anti-Catholic bigotry was abroad in the land. Although the virulently anti-Catholic American Protective Association had withered in size and influence by 1900, the rebirth of the Ku-Klux-Klan in 1915 offered fresh proof that nativism was endemic.[6]

The Leader remained vigilant. Fearing the proscription of sacramental wine, the paper condemned the burgeoning prohibition movement as an anti-Catholic conspiracy.[7] The Leader attacked a veteran's organization, the Guardians of the American Republic, for appointing a "doting old humbug (and) miserable bigot" as grand marshall to one of its parades:

> (Nelson) Miles is a confessed bigot. He was one of the ringleaders of an association that would deprive Catholics of every right and privilege as American citizens, simply and solely because they are Catholics. . . . That contemptible whelp should be drummed out of camp.[8]

While the Leader viewed discrimination from a distinctly Catholic perspective, the Irish World and the Gaelic-American saw it in more secular terms. The Gaelic-American attacked references to the Irish as "happy-go-lucky celts."[71] The Irish World boasted of its "40 year campaign" against the "stage Irishman."[72]

The Irish World condemned moving-pictures--a popular source of entertainment among immigrants--for distorted depictions of the Irish. The so-called Hogan movies, which were peopled with Irish gangsters, prompted real-life hoodlums to adopt Irish names, according to the Irish World, thereby heaping additional slander upon the Irish race.[73] Other movies libeled Irish women by depicting them as frequenting dances and partaking in other, equally dubious "debaucheries."[74] The Irish World complained:

> We have succeeded in driving the stage Irish from the theatres. We should not permit moving picture shows to perpetuate foul anti-Irish calumnies the defunct "stage Irishman sought to perpetuate.[75]

The Irish World's campaign became at times a reactionary descent into philistinism. Among the newspaper's earlier targets were the plays of Lady Gregory. Ironically, Gregory was one of the guiding lights of the Gaelic renaissance, a spontaneous blossoming of arts and letters which arose out of Ireland at the turn of the century to win worldwide critical acclaim.[76]

For the Irish World, however, Lady Gregory's fascination with folk themes and the lyrical rythmns of Irish peasant speech

inspired more shame and indignation than pride. Even as the paper regaled in the past glories of Irish arts and culture, it damned their manifestation on stage. Hobbled by a long and often demeaning colonial past, many Irish were incapable of distinguishing description from slander.

This hypersensitivity, evident in all three newspapers, was in part a reaction against the popular stereotype of the Irish "Paddy," a drunken, childlike, often truculent oaf. A creation of early Victorian imagination, "Paddy" made his first appearance in American periodicals after the Civil War and became a regular figure in Puck and Harper's Weekly until well after the turn of the century.''

In the 1880's, the Irish were portrayed in graphic humor as the most unruly element in the nation. The Anglo-Saxon dimension was unmistakable: In many caricatures, "Paddy" is a riotous, reckless fanatic, "eternally hostile to Great Britain;"' in others, he is a drunken, priest-ridden fool, more content to wallow in squalor and indolence than to embrace the more proper Yankee (i.e. Anglo-Saxon) virtues of thrift and sobriety. An 1884 cartoon in Puck, for example, depicted St. Patrick as a bearded, simian-faced Catholic bishop--a tangle of snakes at his feet, a crooked miter perched precariously upon his head, and a large jug of rye whiskey in his fist.''

Irish women fared little better. The stereotypical Irish female was "Queen of the Kitchen," a "funny , disorderly, hardworking but unpredictable servant girl" whose hard-earned

wages were squandered in support of squalling children, dissolute husbands, and lazy, feckless relatives.[80]

After the turn of the century, the image of the Irish in graphic humor was in transition. "Paddy," the bomb-wielding agitator and booze-addled gorilla, was giving way to more affectionate and sentimental, if slightly condescending portrayals. In the Hearst papers, for example, "Happy Houligan," a whimsical shanty Irishman, began to share the comic pages with "Maggie and Jiggs," an upwardly mobile, lace-curtain Irish couple.[81] "Maggie and Jiggs" endured well into the 1960's.

But the rising status of "Paddy" on the comic-page offered little reassurance to Irish editors. As John Appel observed, ethnic stereotypes ". . . hastened and intensified the growth of national and ethnic consciousness among those who became the targets of the cartoonists pen."[82] For the insecure and overly sensitive Irish, still burdened by their colonial past, those tendencies were magnified. Irish editors were inclined to neither forgive nor to forget. They continued to man the barricades against the threat of further Anglo-Saxon slander and to rage against real and imagined insults.

## The Mainstream Press

For Irish editors, the chief agents of anti-Irish sentiment in the United States were mass circulation daily newspapers. Even before the War became the dominant issue, the news and

editorial columns of the Leader and the Gaelic-American poured forth a steady stream of venom directed at the "anglomaniac press." The Irish World took a more restrained approach until rising war fever and events in Ireland urged it too into action.

Joseph Pulitzer's New York World was a favorite target. When the World ran a St. Patrick's Day editorial in 1914 suggesting that the Irish should throw their support behind the Panama canal treaty with Britain, the Gaelic-American issued a strong rebuttal:

> The New York World is the lowest, dirtiest, most corrupt, dishonest and unprincipled newspaper in the United States. . . . its impudence is unparalleled in the annals of journalism. . . . the men who run the World hate all the Irish.[83]

The Gaelic-American called upon its readers to punish the New York World--the "worst enemy of the Irish race in America"--by withholding advertisements from the death notice section (the Irish "sports page") of the World.

But the most unpardonable crime, for editor John Devoy, was Pulitzer's lack of solidarity with the Irish struggle against Britain:

> Irish citizens of this country . . . have always given energetic support to all efforts to stop the persecution of Jews in other countries . . . and have never blamed them for using their power and influence in this country to ameliorate the lot of their kindred.[84]

Yet when "Irish citizens of the United States" opposed Britain in behalf of their brethren abroad they were attacked, according to Devoy, in the "Jewish-owned press."[85] Devoy's campaign against the New York World would become increasingly anti-Semitic as the months advanced.

The Gaelic-American regularly attacked the other New York dailies. It condemned the New York Tribune for printing "lies" about James Larkin, an Irish-born radical who would later be imprisoned in the United States for labor agitation. "The Tribune," the Gaelic-American offered, "is run by a man whose sister is married to King George's Chief Stable Boy and the paper is doing England's dirty work."[36]

The Gaelic-American accused the Times of unjust attacks on the loyalty of the Irish and other ethnics:

> There is a hyphen in the term Anglo-Saxon, yet these unnaturalized Anglo-Saxons like Mr. Ochs of the Times, who is not an American, are ever referring to Irish and German citizens as "hyphenated Americans."[37]

Oswald Garrison Villard, editor of the Evening Post, attracted Devoy's particular wrath for committing the most unpardonable of sins for an Irishman--criticizing agitation in support of the Irish national struggle:

> (Villard is) . . . an anti-Irish Irishman attacking his own people for the applause of Anglomaniacs. He works himself up into a white heat, froths at the mouth and dips his pen in the froth.[38]

On the west coast, the Leader echoed the Gaelic-American's sentiments. The Leader not only matched the Gaelic-American in ferocity, it also went beyond the New York paper's more single-minded campaign, gathering into its sweep the Catholic press and the labor press as well as the mainstream, west-coast dailies.

Again, the Leader often acted from a Catholic perspective. It accused the Associated Press of trying to stir up anti-Catholic sentiment by "giving prominence" to a violent physical

attack in Denver upon a man named Spurgeon. The victim, according to the Leader, was "a low-brow bigot . . . (a) miserable whelp (who) . . . openly charged that every priest has concubines among the members of their congregation."[8] Rather than condemn the beating the Leader, in the same report, inferred that it was deserved.

The Leader also regularly attacked the Sacramento Bee and its editor, Charles McClatchy, for engaging in "hyphenism" and casting aspersions on Irish-American patriotism. The Bee, according to the Leader:

> . . . spoils with printer's ink a certain amount of perfectly good paper that could be used much more profitably for sanitary purposes. The B is so-called because it is the initial letter of blackmailer, blackguard and blackleg, of brute, beast, bully, blowhard and bigot, of bluster, blab and bilk, of bogus, bore, bughouse and bull . . . (etc.) Chump McClatchy is the original human gas bag.[9]

The Leader condemned the progressive movement--and the daily newspapers which promoted it--as a conspiracy to undermine Irish successes in politics. Scripps' San Francisco Daily News--a favorite target--was criticized for casting slurs upon the Irish, for questioning Irish loyalty to the United States, and for accusing the Irish of being clannish and corrupt in politics. The Leader often betrayed a puritanical sensitivity about the portrayal of Irish immigrants in the columns of the Daily News. In its condemnation of a serial entitled, "Confessions of a Wife," the Leader wrote:

> This Alexandrine indecency written by some anonymous hack with the mind of a slut and the pen of a pander portrays the Irish servant girl before her high-brow employer as the usual soft, slushy, ignorant, untidy and half-witted

> slattern of the anti-Irish stage, with her impossible brogue of "kape" and "indade," and her blasphemous references to the "blissid son of the holy virgin."[31]

On another occasion, the Leader called on its readers to boycott the Daily News for characterizing the Irish as "Pats:"

> (The Daily News) . . . shows its pro Johnny Bull preferences by its sneers at the people of Irish birth and descent. . . the bigoted sewer-rat weaklings that turn out the Daily News should be made to answer for this gratuitous insult."[32]

For the Gaelic-American, the primary battle was against an external, easily recognizable foe--the powerful daily press. In Yorke's Leader, however, the enemy was often more insidious, the terms of engagement more complex. "Anglomania" was most damaging to Irish-Catholics when it arose, like a sickness, from within their own ranks. It was a debilitating affliction of the spirit--a manifestation of the "slave mind" that robbed the Irish of their self-esteem, leaving them bereft of dignity and direction. For the Leader, there was no more fertile breeding ground for the "slave mind" than the Catholic press:

> The most frequently repeated slander about the Irish is their want of unity. The Irish can never agree about anything. They are always fighting between themselves. If you want to roast an Irishman you can always find another Irishman to light the fire. . . This marks the ultimate triumph of the English campaign that Irishman take themselves at England's valuation. . . We found one example last week in the Omaha True Voice. We find a lower, dirtier and more despicable example in the Milwaukee Catholic Citizen."[33]

The Leader urged the Catholic press to "lay aside that yellow streak" and become more confident of its Catholic identity and more assertive in its expression."[34] For the Leader, Catholicism and Irishness were inseparable.

## Conclusions

Anglophobia was the central expression of Irish-American identity--the well-spring of Irish-American consciousness as articulated by the press. It was a primary source of communal solidarity, the social glue which held the Irish together, transcending social, political and even generational differences within the Irish-American community.

However faulty and fraught with contradictions, anglophobia offered simple explanation of complex issues. It explained the second-class status of the Irish; it served as a weapon against nativist attacks and perceived misrepresentations in the mainstream press; and most of all, it soothed feelings of inferiority. Anglophobia was at once an assertion of ethnic distinctiveness and a cry for understanding and acceptance.

The primary role of the Irish-American press at the beginning of the 20th century was to make sense out of the tangle of aspirations and insecurities and to devise comprehensible strategies by which respectability and acceptance might be won by the Irish in America. But an even greater hurdle remained. As America moved inexorably toward war, the Irish-American press would scramble for a strategy by which hatred of Britain and all things Anglo-Saxon might somehow be kept in harmony with loyalty to the United States.

At the eve of World War I, Ireland was emerging from its long colonial past. In America, the immigrants and their

offspring remained a nation of uneasy exiles in search of a definition of themselves. The Irish-American press provided that definition in an American context and served--as was descended upon Europe and rebellion stirred in Ireland--as a lightening rod for their collective rage.

The example of the Irish-American press suggests that ethnic newspapers can only be understood in relation to their mainstream counterparts. In the absence of a comprehending or sympathetic mainstream press, Irish-American newspapers provided a critical forum in which the passions, insecurities and conflicting yearnings of the Irish might be voiced and reconciled. The Irish-American press stood not merely as an ethnic supplement to the mainstream press, but as its adversary. A war of ideas was being waged.

## Notes

[1] Thirteenth Census of the United States, volume 1 (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1912).

[2] John Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York: Atheneum, 1965) 137.

[3] Hanno Hardt, "The Foreign-Language Press in American History," Journal of Communications (Spring, 1989): 118-119.

[4] Robert E. Park, The Immigrant Press and Its Control (New York: Harper, 1922). Park argued that the immigrant press, like its mainstream counterpart, is essentially opportunistic. Driven by the need to turn a profit, its first duty is to survive. As a consequence, the press turns away from controversy and opinion and moves toward the middle of the socio/political spectrum and a more objective brand of news in its pursuit of advertising dollars.

[5] for a discussion of the limitations of enhancer-delayer theory, see Ulf Jonas Bjork, The Swedish-American Press: Three Newspapers and Their Communities, diss., (U of Washington: 1987) 25-26.

[7] Park 9-10. See also Carl Wittke, The German Language Press in America (Louisville: U of Kentucky, 1957), Carl Heinz Knoch, The German Immigrant Press in Milwaukee, diss., Ohio State U, 1969, (New York: Arno, 1980) and Marion Tuttle Marzolf, The Danish Language Press in America, diss., U of Michigan Press, 1972, (New York: Arno, 1979). Wittke, Knoche and Marzolf generally confirm Park's findings on the dual role of the immigrant press. Marzolf argues, however, that earlier analyses have failed to acknowledge the evolutionary character of the press and the changing needs of its readership.

[9] In 1913, at least 25 newspapers devoted to Irish interests were published in the United States. See Ayers & Sons, Ayers Newspaper Directory (Philadelphia: Ayers, 1913). The number could be much greater. Irish newspapers, perhaps because they were published in English, were not classified by ethnicity as were foreign-language newspapers. Available data is also deceptive because Catholic newspapers, most of which were edited by Irish clerics, often gave extensive coverage tomatters of Irish concern. In addition to the papers cited in

this study, other major papers included the Chicago Citizen, the Western Watchman of St. Louis, the Boston Pilot, the Northwestern Chronicle and the Minneapolis Irish Standard.

Irish-American newspapers were weeklies. Because the chief role of the Irish press lay in editorial interpretation, there was no need for an Irish daily press. See William L. Joyce, Editors and Ethnicity. A History of the Irish-American Press 1848-1883, diss., U of Michigan, 1974, (New York: Arno, 1976), 176.

[9] Paul J. Foik, Pioneer Catholic Journalism (New York: The United States Catholic Historical Society, 1930) 12. Irish nationalism was largely forged by the immigrant experience in the United States and the Irish-American press was the chief agent of nationalism. see Thomas N. Brown, Irish-American Nationalism (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1966) 20, 37.

[10] Ayers & Sons, Ayers Newspaper Directory (Philadelphia: Ayers, 1913): 640.

[11] Ayers 637

[12] Kerby Miller, Emigrants and Exiles. Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America (New York: Oxford UP, 1985) 497. Thomas N. Brown, "The Origins and Character of Irish-American Nationalism," Review of Politics 18 (1956): 337.

[13] Mainstream weeklies in the U.S. carried an average of 50 percent advertising (of total column inches) in the early twentieth century. The Danish press, by contrast, contained 18 to 30 percent ads. Marzolf 125. Of the newspapers analysed in the present study, only the Leader had an advertising ratio approaching that of the Danish press. Ad content in the Irish World and the Gaelic-American was often well below 10 percent.

In an earlier period Patrick Ford, founder of the Irish World, believed that weekly newspapers could be supported by circulation alone, and that because the chief function of the Irish-American press lay in editorial interpretation, there was no need fo an Irish daily press. William Joyce, Editors and Ethnicity. A History of the Irish-American Press 1848-1883. diss., U of Michigan, 1974, (New York: Arno, 1976), 176.

[14] see Gerald J. Baldasty and Jeffrey B. Rutenbeck, "Money, Politics and Newspapers: The Business Environment of Press Partisanship in the Late Nineteenth Century," Journalism History (Spring 1989). also Gerald J. Baldasty, "The Industrial Revolution. Press and News in America, 1880-1900," unpublished paper presented at the West Coast Journalism Historians Conference, San Francisco, February 1987.

[15] Baldasty and Rutenbeck 17.

[16] Thirteenth Census of the United States, vol. 1. 879.

[17] A.J. Ward, "America and the Irish Problem, 1899-1921," Irish Historical Studies March 1968: 64.

[18] Arnold Schier, Ireland and the American Emigration 1850-1900 (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1958) 9.

[19] Miller 496-499.

[20] Miller 503.

[21] Thomas N. Brown, Irish-American Nationalism (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1966) 180.

[22] John Higham, Strangers in the Land (New York: Athenem, 1965) 137.

[23] quoted in Rita J. Simon, Public Opinion and the Immigrant. Print Media Coverage 1880-1980 (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1986) 140.

[24] Gaelic-American 23 May 1914: 1.

[25] Miller 498.

[26] Protestants who emigrated from the north of Ireland often sought to distinguish themselves from the southern Irish by calling themselves Scotch-Irish. The generally considered themselves to be British.

[27] Brown and Ward provide excellent discussions on the depth of Irish-American antipathy toward Great Britain. Also see Dean R. Esslinger, "American German and Irish Attitudes Toward Neutrality, 1914-1917: A Study of Catholic Minorities," Catholic Historical Review (July 1967). Esslinger cites several studies which assert that prior to America's entry into WWI, most Irish-Americans hoped for Britain's defeat. Wittke, The Irish in America, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana UP, 1957), concludes that Irish-Americans initially supported Germany out of hatred for Britain.

[28] Carl Meyerhuber, "U.S. Imperialism and Ethnic Imperialism: The New Manifest Destiny as Reflected in Boston's Irish-American Press, 1890-1900," Eire/Ireland 9 (Winter 1974): 24.

[29] Joseph E. Cuddy, Irish-America and National Isolation: 1914-1920, diss., State U of New York, 1965, (New York: Arno, 1976) 12. For a full discussion, see Michael Kraus, The Writing of American History (Oklahoma: Oklahoma UP, 1953) 242-270.

[30] A.J. Ward, "America and the Irish Problem, 1899-1921," Irish Historical Studies March 1968: 70.

[31] Cuddy, National Isolation 41.

[32] Carl Wittke, The Irish in America (Baton Rouge: U of Louisiana Press, 1956) 163.

[33] "Anglomaniacs Urge War," editorial, Irish World 11 March 1914: 4.

[34] "Americans Not Anglo-Saxons," editorial, Gaelic-American 16 May 1914: 4.

[35] "Mayor and Anglo-Saxons," Leader 11 March 1916: 11.

[36] "Anglicizing Sisters," Gaelic-American 25 April 1914: 8.

[37] "English Flunkeyism in U.S. Army," editorial, Gaelic-American 23 Sept. 1916: 4.

[38] "Post Office Pro-British Agencies," editorial, Irish World 8 Aug. 1914: 4.

[39] "That Peace Fiasco," editorial, Leader 21 Feb. 1914: 4.

[40] "That Peace Fiasco," editorial, Leader 1 Nov. 1913: 4.

[41] Kerby Miller 280-281. Arnold Schrier, Ireland and the American Emigration 1850-1900 (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1958) 157.

[42] Miller 7.

[43] Leader 26 Dec. 1914: 4.

[44] "An Irish Famine," Leader 10 July 1915: 2.

[45] "Famine," Irish World 23 May 1914: 10.

[46] "Recruiting For Irish Industries," editorial, Irish World 3 Oct. 1914: 4.

[47] "Irish Race Convention," Irish World 11 March 1916: 1.

[48] "Resolutions," editorial, Irish World 11 March 1916: 4.

[49] Miller 550.

[50] "An Irish Famine," Leader 10 July 1915: 2.

[51] "To Future Empire Builders, editorial, Gaelic-American 12 Jan. 1918: 4.

[52] "Duffy's Irish History," Leader 24 Jan. 1918: 4.

[53] "England Against Revival," Irish World 8 April 1916: 7.

[84] "Stage Irishman Booster," editorial, Leader 24 May 1913: 4.

[85] "Latest Martyr," editorial, Irish World 12 Aug. 1916: 4. "Ireland's Past and Future," editorial, Irish World 24 Jan. 1914: 4. "Acme of Hypocrisy," editorial, Gaelic-American 31 Oct. 1914: 4.

[86] "Sober Sovereigns," editorial, Leader 17 April 1915: 4.

[87] "Slave Mind," reprint from Sinn Fein, Gaelic-American 3 Oct. 1914: 8.

[88] A. Newman, "Robert Emmet, An Appreciation," Leader 30 Oct. 1915: 6.

[89] "John Stuart Mill on Ireland," editorial, Irish World 1 July 1916: 4.

[90] "Asquith's Admission," editorial, Irish World 3 June 1916: 4.

[91] "Wilson Wins Pyrrhic Victory," Gaelic-American 18 Nov. 1916: 8.

[92] "Not To Be Ashamed Of," editorial, Leader 6 February 1915: 4.

[93] "An Irish Deficiency," editorial, Irish World 10 March 1917: 4.

[94] Joe Harrington, "Friends of Irish Freedom," Irish World13 Jan. 1917: 5.

[95] "Fund For Volunteers Going," Leader 7 Aug. 1915: 1.

[96] "Asquith's Admission," editorial, Irish World 3 June 1916: 4.

[97] "Fund for Volunteers Growing," Leader 7 Aug. 1915: 1.

[98] Edward Wakin, Enter the Irish-American, (New York: Thomas Crowell, 1976) 77. Cuddy, National Isolation 115.

[99] "Prohibition," Leader 4 May 1914: 1.

[70] "Doting Old Miles," editorial, Leader 2 Oct. 1915: 4.

[71] "Post's Slurs Resented," Gaelic-American 28 Nov. 1915: 7.

[72] "Anti-Irish Moving Pictures," editorial, Irish World 18 April 1918: 4.

[73] "Defaming Irish Race," editorial, Irish World 24 Jan. 1914: 4.

[74] "Anti-Irish Moving Pictures," editorial, Irish World 18 April 1918: 4.

[75] "Defaming Irish Race," editorial, Irish World 24 Jan. 1914: 4.

[76] Mary McWhorter, "Gross Libel to Irish Race," letter, Irish World 25 Dec. 1915: 5.

[77] John J. Appel, "From Shanties to Lace Curtains: The Irish Image in Puck, 1876-1910," Comparative Studies in Sociology and History 13 (1971): 372.

[78] Appel 367.

[79] Appel 371.
[80] Appel 367.

[81] Shannon 144.

[82] Appel 375.

[83] "World's Audacious Impudence," editorial, Gaelic-American 21 March 1914: 4.

[84] Editorial, Gaelic-American 21 March 1914: 4.

[85] "Pulitzer's Colossal Impudence," editorial Gaelic-American 14 Feb. 1914: 4.

[86] "Tribune's Vile Lie About Larkin," editorial, Gaelic-American 5 Dec. 1914: 4.

[87] "Newspapers Conspire to Provoke Riot," Gaelic-American 26 Dec. 1914: 1.

[88] "Villard," editorial, Gaelic-American 30 Oct. 1915: 4.

[89] "Spurgeon Affair," editorial, Leader 18 April 1914: 4.

[90] "A Hyphen Examined Home," editorial, Leader 27 May 1916: 4.

[91] "The 'Dirty' Daily News," editorial, Leader 13 Feb. 1915: 4.

[92] "The Dirty News," editorial, Leader 23 Jan. 1915: 4.

[93] "The Milwaukee Copperhead," editorial, Leader 11 March 1916: 4.

[94] "Why The Apology," editorial, Leader 11 July 1914: 4.